



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/855,457

05/15/2001

K. Douglas Gennetten

10007458-1

9232

22879

7590

07/30/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SELBY, GEVELL V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2615

2

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/855,457

Applicant(s)

GENNETTEN, K. DOUGLAS

Examiner

Gevell Selby

Art Unit

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 May 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "An" in line 1 should be replaced with "A". Appropriate correction is required.
2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said docking portion" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285.**

In regard to claim 26, Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, discloses a method of displaying digital images comprising:

Art Unit: 2615

coupling a digital camera (see figure 2, element 102) to a camera mount (see figure 2, 150) wherein the camera mount is electrically connected to said digital camera (see column 3, lines 20-30); and

displaying digital images on an LCD (see figure 2, element 103) of said digital camera (see column 14, lines 4-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422.**

In regard to claim 1, Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, discloses a camera dock (see figure 2) comprising:

a mounting portion (see figure 2, element 208) for receiving a digital camera comprising a monitor (see figure 7, element 300) for viewing images;

a support portion (see figure 2, element 100) pivotally coupled to said docking portion wherein said support portion is in contact with a surface (see column 4, lines 20-24);

wherein said mounting portion further comprises a port (see figure 2, element 212) for receiving a cable for power and data connections wherein said cable is connected to a processor of another device (see column 4, lines 3-20 and column 5, lines 57-67).

The Ganthier reference does not disclose that the monitor is an LCD monitor. Official Notice is taken for the use an LCD monitor with a digital camera. It would have been obvious to configure the Ganthier camera to comprise an LCD monitor in order to have a compact size, perfectly flat screen, and superior image quality.

In regard to claim 2, Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, discloses the camera dock of claim1, where said cable is a USB cable (see column 3, lines 30-32).

In regard to claim 4, Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, discloses the camera dock of claim 1, wherein said support portion further comprises an indent on a bottom portion of the support portion (see figure 6, elements 136 and 138) so as to allow said cable to pass under the support portion with sufficient room so as to not lift the support portion off of the surface (see column 5, lines 36-39).

7. Claims 3, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285.

In regard to claim 3, Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, discloses the camera dock of claim 1. The Ganthier reference does not disclose that the mounting portion further comprises at least one function button for activating/deactivating a first function.

Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, discloses a camera mount with several function buttons including a selector switch for switching between the different modes of the device (see column 37, lines 16-21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, to have a function button to switch between the different modes of the device in order to make the camera less complicated to operate by controlling multiple functions with the one button instead of multiple buttons.

In regard to claim 12, Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, discloses the camera dock of Claim 1. The Ganthier reference does not disclose that the mounting portion further comprises a light-emitting diode indicating a status of the camera dock.

The Morikawa reference discloses a camera docking station an LED (see figure 2, element 154) for indicating a communication state (see column 7, lines 31-32).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, to comprise a light-emitting diode for indicating a communication state in order for the user to easily recognize the status of the camera by looking at the indicator.

In regard to claim 13, Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, discloses the camera dock of Claim 1. The Ganthier reference does not disclose that camera is mounted to said dock such that said LCD faces a user.

Art Unit: 2615

The Morikawa reference discloses a camera docking station (see figure 33, element 1150) with a retaining portion where the user places the camera (see figure 33, element 1100) with the LCD (see 30, element 1103) facing them and the camera is also tilted in the holder to provide a better view for the user (see column 36, lines 6-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, to have the camera mounted to the dock such that the LCD faces the user in order to provide a better view for the user while reviewing the images captured by the camera on the screen.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Yanagisawa, 5,223,875.

In regard to claim 5, Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, discloses the camera dock of Claim 1. Ganthier does not disclose that the support portion further comprises an infrared sensor for remote operation of the dock.

Yanagisawa, US 5,223,875, discloses a camera mount with an infrared sensor (see figure 4, element 3) that receives signals from a remote control device (see figure 4, element 4) to permit a remote shutter release operation and also to rotate the camera by remote operation (see column 1, lines 43-50). Yanagisawa teaches the camera is arranged to permit taking a picture under remote control have the an object to be photographed in the center of the picture plane (see column 1, lines 43-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of

Art Unit: 2615

Yanagisawa, 5,223,875, to have an infrared sensor to permit a remote image capture and rotation of the camera by remote control in order for the user to operate the camera movement and capture image from a distance with the object of the picture centered in the picture frame.

9. Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285 and Inubushi et al., US 6,148,075.

In regard to claim 6, Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, discloses the camera dock of claim 1. The Ganthier reference does not disclose that the mounting portion further comprises at least one illuminated button for activating/deactivating a first function.

Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, discloses a camera mount with several function buttons including: a selector switch for switching between the different modes of the device, tuning buttons, and a power ON/OFF button (see column 37, lines 16-21).

Inubushi et al., US 6,148,075, teaches using illuminated buttons on an electronic device, in this case a mobile phone, to enable the user to operate the device even in the night or in dark places (see column 1, lines 12-18).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, and Inubushi et al., US 6,148,075, to have an illuminated function buttons to switch between the to control various functions of the device and that can be operated in a dark place.

Art Unit: 2615

In regard to claim 7, modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, and Inubushi et al., US 6,148,075, discloses the camera dock of Claim 6. The Morikawa reference discloses wherein said first function is selected is a TV mode wherein the TV Tuner (see figure 35, element 1336) receives predetermined TV signals selected by using the tuning buttons (see column 10, lines 27-29).

In regard to claim 8, modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, and Inubushi et al., US 6,148,075, discloses the camera dock of Claim 1. The Morikawa reference discloses wherein said mounting portion further comprises a first button (see figure 32, element 1159: top button), a second button (see figure 32, element 1159: bottom button) and a third button (see figure 32, element 1158) wherein each button activates/deactivates a particular function (see column 37, lines 16-22).

In regard to claim 9, modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, and Inubushi et al., US 6,148,075, discloses the camera dock of Claim 8. The Morikawa reference discloses that the first button activates/deactivates a television function (see column 37, lines 21-22).

In regard to claim 10, modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, and Inubushi et al., US 6,148,075, discloses the camera dock of Claim 8. The Ganthier reference does not disclose that the second illuminated button activates/deactivates a printer function.

The Morikawa reference discloses an embodiment wherein the camera dock comprises a card seal printer with a plurality of key switches that the user uses to

Art Unit: 2615

selectively instructs various processes including a printing process (see column 48, lines 3-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, and Inubushi et al., US 6,148,075, to have a illuminated function button to instruct a printing process.

In regard to claim 11, modify Ganthier et al., US 6,081,422, in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, and Inubushi et al., US 6,148,075, discloses the camera dock of Claim 8. The Ganthier reference implies that when the camera operation is selected with the function button, the camera will communicate with the PC (see column 5, lines 62-65).

10. Claims 14 and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478.

In regard to claim 14, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, discloses a camera mount comprising:

a hosting device (tripod) including a flat surface for mounting a camera including a user interface (see column 3, lines 15-25);

a hollow post (see figure 6, element 13) on said flat surface wherein said post is sized to fit within a mounting hole of the camera (see column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 6); and

wherein the user interface of the camera also functions as the user interface of the hosting device (see column 4, lines 50-60).

The McIntyre reference does not disclose a trigger device for raising and lowering a first connector located within the hollow post wherein said first connector mates with a complementary connector located within the mounting hole of the camera.

Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, discloses a camera mount with a mount screw (136) that may be inserted into the screw hole of the camera, and then the operation knob (133) or trigger may be rotated to raise the screw into threaded engagement with the hole so that the mount can be fixed to the camera (see column 6, lines 37-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, to have a trigger device for raising and lowering a first connector located within the hollow post wherein said first connector mates with a complementary connector located within the mounting hole of the camera in order to have the mount fixed to the camera or disconnected from the camera.

In regard to claim 19, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, discloses the camera mount of claim 14, wherein the first connector is located within said hollow post (see column 4, lines 15-16: The inside of the hollow post is the first contact.).

In regard to claim 20, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, discloses the camera mount of claim 14, wherein the trigger device is coupled to a mechanical linkage for raising and lowering the first connector (see Hayashida: see column 6, lines 37-51).

In regard to claim 21, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, discloses the camera mount of claim 14, wherein the post press-fits snugly into the mounting hole of the camera (see column 4, lines 38-49).

In regard to claim 22, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, discloses the camera mount of Claim 14, wherein the post is threaded (see column 4, lines 40-41).

In regard to claim 23, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, discloses the camera mount of Claim 14, wherein the post is made of rubber (see column 4, lines 41-43).

In regard to claims 24 and 25, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, discloses the camera mount of Claim 14. The McIntyre reference discloses from figures 2-8 that there are several ways to configure the electromechanical connection between the camera hole and the mounting screw. In figure 8, flag shaped contacts 35 A and B connected to the camera are lowered into the screw hole to complete the circuit (see column 4, lines 17-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to modify McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, to have the first connector include a flag-shaped contact to complete the circuit with a flag-shaped contact in the camera hole.

11. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285.

In regard to claim 15, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, discloses the camera mount of claim 14.

The McIntyre and Hayashida references do not disclose that the first connector is coupled to a power source.

Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, discloses a portable TV telephone apparatus with an image pickup device that couples to a station with an input/output port to connect to the apparatus and a power output terminal whereby the station is electrically connected to the apparatus in order to supply power to the TV telephone apparatus (see column 3, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, in further view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, to have the first connector coupled to a power source in order to supply power to the camera when connected to the mount.

In regard to claim 18, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, in further view of Morikawa et al., US 5,528,285, discloses the camera mount of claim 14, wherein the first connector includes pins for power connections to a power supply of the camera (see figure 3, element 152 and column 3, lines 20-29: The I/O port has pins to make an electrical connection to the TV telephone apparatus).

12. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Squilla et al., US 6,078,756.

Art Unit: 2615

In regard to claim 16, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, discloses the camera mount of claim 14.

McIntyre and Hayashida references do not disclose that the first connector is coupled to a memory device.

Squilla et al., US 6,078,756, discloses a camera mount that transmits data to the memory of an attached camera through a cable connection (see column 4, lines 38-52). The additional information sent to the camera is stored along with the image data in memory (see column 4, lines 52-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have been motivated to modify McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, in further view of Squilla et al., US 6,078,756, to have the first connector coupled to a memory device in order to save additional information along with the image data.

In regard to claim 17, McIntyre et al., US 5,598,237, in view of Hayashida et al., US 5,081,478, in further view of Squilla et al., US 6,078,756, discloses the camera mount of claim 14, wherein the first connector includes pins for data connections to a memory of the camera (see Squilla: column 4, lines 47-50: The RS-232 connector contain pins for making the data connections.)

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following art discloses camera mounts:

US 6,400,903,

US 5,382,167,

US 6,628,325,

US 6,195,513,


US 6,657,654.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gevell Selby whose telephone number is 703-305-8623. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 5:30 PM (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Christensen can be reached on 703-308-9644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gvs


TUAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER